

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**LORD**

MAY 31 2005

Lord Corporation
Legal Services
111 Lord Drive
PO Box 8012
Cary, NC 27512-8012
(919) 468-4979 ext. 6207
FAX: (919) 469-5226**CONFIDENTIAL**
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: US Patent Office

FROM: Heather B. Caruso

DATE: May 31, 2005

NO. PAGES: 3, including cover page

FAX Number: 703-872-9306

CC: G. Knable (fax-571-273-1220)

In Re: Tokas, et. al. Docket No. IR-2588 DIV1 (ET)
Serial No. 09/711,692 Group Art Unit: 1733
Filed: 11/13/00 Examiner: G. Knable

Dear Sir,

Attached please find pages 1 and 2 of our Reply After Final that we mailed on April 28, 2005. It has come to our attention from the examiner that the patent attorney, Miles Dearth, failed to sign the reply before it was mailed. Please accept Mr. Dearth's signature on page 2 to correct the error. If you have any questions, please call me at 919-468-5979 ext. 6207. Thank you. Please confirm receipt of this facsimile.

Yours truly,

Heather B. Caruso, CLA
Patent Paralegal**Confidentiality Notice**

The information contained in this transmission is confidential and is solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, please advise the sender immediately at the above phone number and destroy all pages. Any disclosure, copying or further distribution is prohibited unless explicitly approved in writing by Lord Corporation.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 31 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Tokas, et al.
Serial No.: 09/711,692
Filed: November 13, 2000
For: "Contact Metathesis Polymerization"

Docket No.: IR-2588DIV-1(ET)
Group Art Unit: 1733
Examiner: G. Knable

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited on the date indicated below with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, DC 20231, with sufficient postage as first class mail (37 CFR 1.8(a)) on:

April 28, 2005 by Miles B. Dearth

 (signature)

REPLY AFTER FINAL

Mail stop: AF
Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 11-30-04, applicants amend the claims to overcome 35 USC § 112 rejections, placing them in condition for allowance. Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review. A petition for extension of time accompanied by fee payment is included in this reply.

Claim 19 is canceled. Amended claim 1 is no longer considered to be generic to this claim. Applicants reserve the option of filing a divisional application as to subject matter encompassed by claim 19.

Claims 1-9, 11-18, 20-43, 45-49, 95, 97 and 99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as indefinite. Claim 1 is amended to recite "applying", consistent with claim 13. Claim 14 is further clarified that the catalyst is "applied dissolved or mixed". This further defines beyond "diluted" which could encompass dissolution, suspension, slurring, with or without mixing.

Claim 16 is canceled, as it referred to non-elected B2.

Claims 45-48 are now indicated as previously presented, thereby rejoined.


With regard to claims 21, 42, and 45, the specification defines "normal ambient conditions" on page 6 as *"temperatures typically found in minimal atmosphere control workplaces (for example, about -20°C to about 40°C), pressure of approximately 1 atmosphere and an air atmosphere that contains a certain amount of moisture."* This term encompasses, but is a broader range as to temperature than "room temperature", defined in the specification on page 6 as *"about 10°C to about 40°C, typically about 20°C to about 25°C"*. Applicants therefore submit that claims 21, 42, and 45 further narrow the broader term "normal ambient" conditions.

With regard to claim 39, Applicants deleted the phrase *"the catalyst is applied in an aqueous solution or mixture and"* with the remaining clause as defining over claim 1, as to 100% reactivity.

Claim 43 is amended according to the recommendation provided, "the liquid carrier" is now recited.

Claim 99 is amended to clarify that the subject matter deals with bonding tire tread to tire carcass, eliminating non-clarity as to what component is applied to what substrate. The meaning and result is clear and further defines merely as to the selection of substrates, and not inconsistent with claim 1.

Respectfully submitted,



Miles B. Dearth
Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 35,115